



Data Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, February 20, 2019 @ 1:00 PM
Michigan Department of Transportation Aeronautics Building
2nd Floor Commission Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan

- 1. Welcome - Call to Order – Introductions**
- 2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items**
- 3. Consent Agenda**
 - 3.1 Approval of the 1-23-19 Data Committee Meeting Minutes (*Action – Attachment 1*)
 - 3.2 TAMC Budget Update (*Attachment 2*)
- 4. Presentations – TAMC Lead Analyst**
 - 4.1. 2018 PASER Data Analysis, Quality Review & Forecast – *Chesbro*
- 5. Review & Discussion Items:**
 - 5.1. Establish Traffic Signal Survey/Inventory Pilot & Subject Matter Experts – *McEntee*
 - 5.2. CRA Data Request – McEntee/Belknap
 - 5.3. Update on Paving Warranties and the TAMC IRT – *McEntee*
 - 5.4. 2017 Draft Reported Investments for TAMC Annual Report – *McEntee*
 - 5.5. Investment Reporting Compliance Review Update – *Belknap (Attachment 3)*
 - 5.6. Investment Reporting: Review Process Requirements for Future Project Data & Three-year Plan Requirements – *McEntee/CSS*
 - 5.7. Work Program: Target Estimated Costs/Priorities by April – *Belknap*
 - 5.8. Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) Update – *CSS*
- 6. Public Comments**
- 7. Member Comments**
- 8. Adjournment**

The next TAMC Data Committee Meeting is scheduled for March 20, 2019 at the MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Room, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing, Michigan

Meeting Telephone Conference Line: 1-877-336-1828 Access Code: 8553654#

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE**

January 23, 2019 at 1:00 p.m.
MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan
MINUTES

****Frequently Used Acronyms Attached**

Members Present:

Bill McEntee, CRA – Chair
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA, via Telephone

Jonathan Start, MTPA/KATS

Support Staff Present:

Roger Belknap, MDOT
John Clark, DTMB/CSS via Telephone
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Tim Lauxmann, DTMB/CSS
Mike Toth, MDOT

Gil Chesbro, MDOT
Tim Colling, LTAP/MTU, via Telephone
Mark Holmes, DTMB/CSS
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Members Absent:

Bob Slattery, MML

Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS

Public Present:

Christopher J. Bolt, MAC
Aaron Verhelle, RCOC

Tim Lemon, MDOT

1. Welcome – Call-to-Order – Introductions:

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:05 p.m. Everyone was introduced and welcomed to the meeting.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

3. Consent Agenda:

3.1. – Approval of November 28, 2018 Data Committee Meeting Minutes - *Action Item* (Attachment 1)

Motion: J. Start made a motion to approve the November 28, 2018 meeting minutes; B. McEntee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

3.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Attachment 2)

An updated financial report (01/18/2019) was provided to the committee.

4. Presentations – Center for Technology and Training/MTU – A. Manty and P. Torola:

4.1. - 2018 Preliminary Summary of PASER Data Analysis – G. Chesbro

G. Chesbro created a draft analysis of the 2018 PASER Data and presented the graphs to the committee. Local agencies collected more data in even years than odd years.

5. Review and Discussion Items:

5.1. – 2017 Draft Reported Bridge Investments for TAMC Annual Report – B. McEntee

B. McEntee presented at the last Bridge Committee meeting his 2017 Draft Reported Bridge Investments (IRT data). After his presentation the committee requested a few minor changes. He is working on making those changes.

5.2. – 2017 Draft Reported Road Investments for TAMC Annual Report – B. McEntee

B. McEntee did a brief presentation to the Data Committee regarding the 2016 – 2018 data. This will be updated the first week of February and presented to the full Council at their February 6, 2019 meeting.

5.3. – Investment Reporting Compliance Review Update – R. Belknap (Attachment 3)

R. Belknap has received the Investment Reporting data. There were a few questions on the 2017 information and R. Belknap is working to get those questions resolved.

The 2018 calendar year preliminary project data will be added to the report. The big difference between 2017 and 2018 is the county data due to the different fiscal year end dates. So far, support staff has not received any county reports for 2018. They are almost halfway through for city and villages.

5.4. –Update on Paving Warranties and the TAMC IRT – B. McEntee

Currently, the IRT collects a small amount of warranty information. TAMC support staff worked with County Road Association (CRA) to develop a warranty compliance report that will contain all the necessary information in the IRT report. In order to capture all of the pertinent warranty information, it was decided to add some additional questions in the IRT. CSS was asked to give an estimate on how much it will cost to add these additional questions into the IRT by November. MTU will be doing training for agencies on the warranties. They are still waiting on the funding to do this. They will work with CRA to develop the training. MML has also been involved per T. Colling. It was suggested to add warranty training and informational documents to the TAMC Website to assist agencies.

Motion: J. Tubbs made a motion for CSS to provide to TAMC an estimate of cost to add the additional Warranty questions into the IRT; J. Start seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

5.5. – Investment Reporting: Review Process of Future Projects and Three-year Plan Requirements – J. Start/B. McEntee

Currently, TAMC does not have any way to find out if agencies are compliant with posting their future projects and three-year plan future projects. B. McEntee gave a brief presentation showing the planned projects that are readily available in the IRT. There is not much information available. In the future TAMC agencies will need to coordinate projects with water and other agencies. TAMC will need to find a way to collect this information and possibly share the projects on a map, particularly large projects, so all affected agencies have access to this information. It may not be much value on the secondary/minor systems. It may also be a good idea to have the public be able to access this information, as well as, have the STIP information in our system.

Motion: J. Start made a motion for CSS to modify the IRT to include ways to determine if agencies are entering future projects and are meeting the three-year planned projects requirements; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

Action Item: Support staff will work with CSS to obtain the necessary requirements for agencies submitting data on future projects, collecting the projects from the agencies, and getting the projects information on a map.

5.6. – Establishing a Traffic Signal Survey/Inventory Pilot and Subject Matter Experts – B. McEntee

This is an ongoing conversation about who should be involved in developing a traffic signal inventory.

B. McEntee requested names of candidates to attend the February TAMC Data Committee meeting and provide expertise on traffic signal surveys. An invitation will be extended to Oakland and MDOT to attend. B. McEntee will establish a group to hold side meetings to discuss traffic signal surveys. Roadsoft did a pilot

with a few agencies in the last few months per M. Toth on what they would like to see regarding Traffic Signals in Roadsoft. The information collected may or may not meet TAMC needs. TAMC will need to find out what kind of information they need at the state level. The context is important. It was noted that some counties only have a very small amount of signals.

Action Item: TAMC Data Committee members should send any traffic signal subject matter expert names to B. McEntee's email so that he can contact them to request their attendance at the February Data Committee meeting.

5.7. – Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) Update – C. Granger/M. Holmes

5.7.1. – Update on Ownership vs. Jurisdiction (Geography) in Data

Some areas in the IRT are based on ownership and others are based on jurisdiction. Some agencies define ownership by who certified the road. MDOT defines ownership by who owns the land. The different agencies that collect this information, such as Michigan State Police (MSP) and MDOT, collect their data differently so if TAMC uses both of their data, the data is going to be different. They need to be standardized so that the data will not differ. The committee would like some idea of the magnitude of the issue and know specifically how the agencies collect their data and how much it is off. The committee needs to know if CSS can convert one or the other's data to make it mesh. A suggestion was made for CSS to create a spreadsheet showing the data that TAMC needs where MSP can populate and send back to CSS.

5.7.2. – Update on Creation of Dashboards for Top 123 Agencies Under Public Act 325

The dashboards have been updated with the Top 123 agencies under Public Act 325.

5.7.3. – Culvert Data Integration of Interactive Map/Dashboards/IRT

CSS would need to use approximately 230 hours (\$23,000/\$100 an hour) to complete the requested task of integrating the culvert data into an interactive map and dashboard from the IRT.

CSS has updated the Safety dashboards and minor fixes to the dashboard have also been completed.

Action Item: J. Start informed the committee that the Metropolitan Planning Organizations must consider and plan for their federal performance measures. Can dashboards be updated to have the geography of MPOs? CSS will pull together a cost estimate for this task. The interactive maps already have this information however, it is requested that this information be added to the dashboards.

6. Public Comments:

CSS has updated the Michigan Geographic Framework (MGF) with new technology. MTU will need to integrate it with Roadsoft. CSS is working with MTU to assure they have all of the deliverables that they need in order to complete their work. They have a meeting this Friday, January 25, 2019, to discuss data format and testing. They will be doing quality control around mid-February on this after it is completed. They will keep the impact on data collection very minimal. CSS will give an update on these efforts in February. One option is to continue with the same version or delay the data collection for PASER. The committee would prefer that they do not delay the PASER spring data collection.

7. Member Comments:

None.

8. Adjournment:

Motion: J. Start made a motion to adjourn the meeting; J. Tubbs seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.. The next meeting is scheduled for February 20, 2019,

at 1:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing.


TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:	
AASHTO	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
ACE	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)
ACT-51	PUBLIC ACT 51 OF 1951-DEFINITION: A CLASSIFICATION SYTEM DESIGNED TO DISTRIBUTE MICHIGAN'S ACT 51 FUNDS. A ROADWAY MUST BE CLASSIFIED ON THE ACT 51 LIST TO RECEIVE STATE MONEY.
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
CPM	CAPITAL PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
CRA	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)
CSD	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)
CSS	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
ESC	EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE
FAST	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FOD	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)
FY	FISCAL YEAR
GLS REGION V	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
GVMC	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL
HPMS	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
IBR	INVENTORY BASED RATING
IRI	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX
IRT	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL
KATS	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
KCRC	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION
LDC	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS
LTAP	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
MAC	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
MAP-21	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21 ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MIC	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE COUNCIL
MITA	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
MML	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MPO	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MTA	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION
MTF	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
MTPA	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION
MTU	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
NBI	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY
NBIS	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS
NFA	NON-FEDERAL AID
NFC	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
PASER	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING
PNFA	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID

PWA	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
QA/QC	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
ROW	RIGHT-OF-WAY
RPA	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SEMCOG	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STC	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STP	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TAMC	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
TAMCSD	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM
WAMC	WATER ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.11.2018.GMS

DRAFT

TAMC Budget Expenditure Report

 Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council		FY17 Budget			FY17 Actual			FY18 Budget			FY18 Actual			FY19 Budget			FY19 Year to Date			FY20 Budget		
		(most recent invoice date)	\$	Spent	Balance	\$	Spent	Balance	\$	Spent	Balance	\$	Spent	Balance	\$	Spent	Balance	\$				
I. Data Collection & Regional-Metro Planning Asset Management Program																						
Battle Creek Area Transportation Study	1 qtr 19	\$	20,000.00	\$	15,444.03	\$	4,555.97	\$	20,500.00	\$	20,213.36	\$	286.64	\$	20,500.00	\$	2,143.27	\$	18,356.73	\$	20,500.00	
Bay County Area Transportation Study	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	10,794.42	\$	9,205.58	\$	21,100.00	\$	8,028.84	\$	13,071.16	\$	21,100.00	\$	-	\$	21,100.00	\$	19,900.00	
Central upper Peninsula Planning and Development	1 qtr 19	\$	40,471.00	\$	40,471.00	\$	-	\$	47,000.00	\$	47,000.00	\$	-	\$	47,000.00	\$	5,487.67	\$	41,512.33	\$	50,000.00	
East Michigan Council of Governments	DEC	\$	95,995.00	\$	80,092.75	\$	15,902.25	\$	111,000.00	\$	81,559.65	\$	29,440.35	\$	111,000.00	\$	16,062.10	\$	94,937.90	\$	108,000.00	
Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	1 qtr 19	\$	20,000.00	\$	20,000.00	\$	-	\$	23,100.00	\$	23,100.00	\$	-	\$	23,100.00	\$	5,943.70	\$	17,156.30	\$	25,000.00	
Genesee Lapeer Shiawassee Region V Planning Com.	NOV	\$	39,423.00	\$	37,172.06	\$	2,250.94	\$	46,000.00	\$	45,954.99	\$	45.01	\$	46,000.00	\$	-	\$	46,000.00	\$	46,000.00	
Grand Valley Metropolitan Council	1 qtr 19	\$	20,000.00	\$	18,974.64	\$	1,025.36	\$	25,000.00	\$	12,060.69	\$	12,939.31	\$	25,000.00	\$	1,112.35	\$	23,887.65	\$	24,000.00	
Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study	1 qtr 19	\$	20,000.00	\$	19,128.11	\$	871.89	\$	22,000.00	\$	21,588.77	\$	411.23	\$	22,000.00	\$	1,102.95	\$	20,897.05	\$	22,000.00	
Macatawa Area Coordinating Council	1 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	7,405.66	\$	12,594.34	\$	20,200.00	\$	9,575.57	\$	10,624.43	\$	20,200.00	\$	190.00	\$	20,010.00	\$	19,000.00	
Midland Area Transportation Study	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	17,660.54	\$	2,339.46	\$	21,000.00	\$	20,857.81	\$	142.19	\$	21,000.00	\$	-	\$	21,000.00	\$	21,000.00	
Northeast Michigan Council of Governments	DEC	\$	43,426.45	\$	43,426.45	\$	-	\$	52,200.00	\$	52,200.00	\$	-	\$	46,000.00	\$	10,175.86	\$	35,824.14	\$	51,000.00	
Networks Northwest	1 qtr 19	\$	61,316.00	\$	61,316.00	\$	-	\$	72,000.00	\$	71,915.46	\$	84.54	\$	72,000.00	\$	10,034.74	\$	61,965.26	\$	75,000.00	
Region 2 Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	37,940.00	\$	24,743.56	\$	13,196.44	\$	42,000.00	\$	29,362.33	\$	12,637.67	\$	42,000.00	\$	-	\$	42,000.00	\$	40,000.00	
Saginaw County Metropolitan Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	11,585.29	\$	8,414.71	\$	22,200.00	\$	22,000.00	\$	200.00	\$	22,200.00	\$	-	\$	22,200.00	\$	21,000.00	
Southcentral Michigan Planning Commission	1 qtr 19	\$	53,162.00	\$	36,915.67	\$	16,246.33	\$	57,300.00	\$	37,137.28	\$	20,162.72	\$	57,300.00	\$	1,913.04	\$	55,386.96	\$	55,000.00	
Southeast Michigan Council of Governments	JAN	\$	135,680.00	\$	135,679.60	\$	0.40	\$	174,000.00	\$	174,000.00	\$	-	\$	174,000.00	\$	34,921.74	\$	139,078.26	\$	174,000.00	
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission	1 qtr 19	\$	37,030.00	\$	37,030.00	\$	-	\$	41,000.00	\$	41,000.00	\$	-	\$	41,000.00	\$	2,584.95	\$	38,415.05	\$	41,000.00	
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	1 qtr 19	\$	33,786.00	\$	33,786.00	\$	-	\$	40,000.00	\$	21,680.54	\$	18,319.46	\$	40,000.00	\$	3,780.24	\$	36,219.76	\$	40,000.00	
West Michigan Regional Planning Commission	SEPT	\$	82,467.00	\$	82,467.00	\$	-	\$	91,000.00	\$	74,351.07	\$	16,648.93	\$	91,000.00	\$	-	\$	91,000.00	\$	88,000.00	
West Michigan Shoreline Regional Development Com.	OCT	\$	46,781.56	\$	46,145.01	\$	636.55	\$	54,000.00	\$	51,333.45	\$	2,666.55	\$	54,000.00	\$	2,725.36	\$	51,274.64	\$	54,000.00	
Western Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	4 qtr 18	\$	34,867.00	\$	34,847.53	\$	19.47	\$	40,000.00	\$	40,000.00	\$	-	\$	40,000.00	\$	-	\$	40,000.00	\$	42,000.00	
MDOT Region Participation & PASER Quality Control	2/5/19	\$	62,750.00	\$	85,337.50	\$	(22,587.50)	\$	80,000.00	\$	52,914.97	\$	27,085.03	\$	91,440.00	\$	6,667.64	\$	84,772.36	\$	80,000.00	
Fed. Aid Data Collection & RPO/MPO Program Total		\$	965,095.01	\$	900,422.82	\$	64,672.19	\$	1,116,400.00	\$	957,834.78	\$	158,565.22	\$	1,116,400.00	\$	104,845.61	\$	1,011,554.39	\$	1,116,400.00	
II. PASER Data Collection (Paved, Non-Federal-Aid System)																						
PASER PNFA Data Collection Total		\$	40,760.39	\$	40,760.39	\$	-	<i>(FY18 PNFA Moved into Data Collection Program Above)</i>			<i>(FY19 PNFA Moved into Data Collection Program Above)</i>			<i>(FY20 PNFA Moved into Data Collection Program Above)</i>								
III. TAMC Central Data Agency (MCSS)																						
Project Management	1/31/19	\$	37,800.00	\$	40,064.00	\$	(2,264.00)	\$	42,000.00	\$	46,585.00	\$	(4,585.00)	\$	42,000.00	\$	17,869.00	\$	24,131.00	\$	380,000.00	
Data Support / Hardware / Software	1/31/19	\$	60,200.00	\$	558,833.00	\$	\$1,367.00	\$	68,800.00	\$	67,800.00	\$	1,000.00	\$	68,800.00	\$	4,225.00	\$	64,575.00	\$	-	
Application Development / Maintenance / Testing	1/31/19	\$	83,280.00	\$	78,238.00	\$	\$5,042.00	\$	114,475.00	\$	115,250.00	\$	(775.00)	\$	114,475.00	\$	9,800.00	\$	104,675.00	\$	-	
Help Desk / Misc Support / Coordination	1/31/19	\$	66,600.00	\$	665,652.00	\$	\$948.00	\$	70,200.00	\$	68,200.00	\$	2,000.00	\$	70,200.00	\$	11,350.00	\$	58,850.00	\$	-	
Training	1/31/19	\$	27,600.00	\$	29,133.00	\$	(1,533.00)	\$	34,950.00	\$	24,850.00	\$	10,100.00	\$	34,950.00	\$	1,450.00	\$	33,500.00	\$	-	
Data Access / Reporting	1/31/19	\$	47,155.00	\$	445,696.00	\$	\$1,459.00	\$	49,575.00	\$	52,175.00	\$	(2,600.00)	\$	49,575.00	\$	19,575.00	\$	30,000.00	\$	-	
<i>FY17 Off Budget: IRT Re-write - \$241,000</i>		9/30/17	\$	241,040.00	\$	260,023.00	\$	(18,983.00)														
TAMC Central Data Agency (MCSS) Total		\$	322,635.00	\$	317,616.00	\$	5,019.00	\$	380,000.00	\$	374,860.00	\$	5,140.00	\$	380,000.00	\$	64,269.00	\$	315,731.00	\$	380,000.00	
IV. TAMC Training & Education (MTU) Calendar Year Z1																						
V. TAMC Activities (MTU) Z15/R1		1/18/19	\$	210,000.00	\$	208,658.90	\$	1,341.10	\$	235,000.00	\$	219,780.57	\$	15,219.43	\$	220,000.00	\$	-	\$	220,000.00	\$	220,000.00
		12/19	\$	70,000.00	\$	60,253.50	\$	9,746.50	\$	115,000.00	\$	114,089.32	\$	910.68	\$	120,000.00	\$	5,485.88	\$	114,514.12	\$	120,000.00
VI. TAMC Expenses																						
Fall Conference Expenses	12/11/18	\$	6,000.00	\$	8,312.40	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	\$	7,269.00	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	\$	7,507.40	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	
Fall Conf. Attendance Fees + sponsorship Fees	12/11/18	\$	-	\$	2,625.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	4,405.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	6,755.00	\$	-	\$	-	
Net Fall Conference	12/11/18	\$	8,625.00	\$	8,312.40	\$	312.60	\$	14,405.00	\$	7,269.00	\$	7,136.00	\$	16,755.00	\$	7,507.40	\$	9,247.60	\$	-	
Spring Conference Expenses	11/5/18	\$	8,000.00	\$	6,721.80	\$	-	\$	3,800.00	\$	7,439.36	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	
Spring Conf. Attendance Fees + sponsorship Fees	8/17/18	\$	-	\$	6,140.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	8,350.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	1,000.00	\$	-	\$	-	
Net Spring Conference	11/5/18	\$	14,140.00	\$	6,721.80	\$	7,418.20	\$	12,150.00	\$	7,439.36	\$	4,710.64	\$	11,000.00	\$	-	\$	11,000.00	\$	10,000.00	
Other Council Expenses	12/19/18	\$	3,915.29	\$	8,483.24	\$	(4,567.95)	\$	10,000.00	\$	7,301.72	\$	2,698.28	\$	10,000.00	\$	935.22	\$	9,064.78	\$	10,000.00	
TAMC Expenses Total		\$	26,680.29	\$	23,517.44	\$	3,162.85	\$	36,555.00	\$	22,010.08	\$	14,544.92	\$	37,755.00	\$	8,442.62	\$	29,312.38	\$	20,000.00	
VII. Culvert Pilot Project																						
Central Data Agency (MCSS)	10/16/18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	15,000.00	\$	9,312.00	\$	5,688.00	\$	25,000.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
MTU Project Management & Training	1/2/19	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	172,100.00	\$	172,100.00	\$	-	\$	15,000.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	15,000.00	
TAMC Administration & Contingency	11/7/18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	84,438.00	\$	-	\$	84,438.00	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Central upper Peninsula Planning and Development	3 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	88,641.00	\$	51,909.64	\$	36,731.36	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
East Michigan Council of Governments	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	328,607.00	\$	259,229.13	\$	69,377.87	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	5,688.00	\$	5,034.70	\$	653.30	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Genesee Lapeer Shiawassee Region V Planning Com.	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	124,909.00	\$	54,266.60	\$	70,642.40	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Grand Valley Metropolitan Council	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	77,782.00	\$	69,733.25	\$	8,048.75	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	50,402.00	\$	15,879.65	\$	34,522.35	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Northeast Michigan Council of Governments	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	33,506.00	\$	21,781.96	\$	11,724.04	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Networks Northwest	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	184,513.00	\$	163,641.05	\$	20,871.95	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Region 2 Planning Commission	3 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	54,900.00	\$	22,776.80	\$	32,123.20	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Southcentral Michigan Planning Commission	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	93,456.00	\$	36,137.17	\$	57,318.83	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Southeast Michigan Council of Governments	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	87,644.00	\$	45,757.96	\$	41,886.04	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	101,849.00	\$	67,138.17	\$	34,710.83	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	47,587.00	\$	6,962.44	\$	40,624.56	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
West Michigan Regional Planning Commission	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	241,511.00	\$	181,441.39	\$	60,069.61	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
West Michigan Shoreline Regional Development Com.	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	144,238.00	\$	89,092.30	\$	55,145.70	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Western Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	63,229.00	\$	46,960.41	\$	16,268.59	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	

Summary Statistics – TAMC Investment Reporting Compliance

As of February 14, 2019

Fiscal Year 2016

Counties	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	83
Cities/Villages	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	526
Not Approved: #1 – No Data or IRT User	1
Not Approved: #2 – IRT & ADARS Not Matching	4
Not Approved: #3 – IRT Status Not Updated	1
Agency Not Yet Reported (Not Yet Due or Extension)	1
MDOT – Approved for Investment Reporting	1

Fiscal Year 2017

Counties	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	83
Cities/Villages	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	523
Not Approved: #1 – No Data or IRT User	2
Not Approved: #2 – IRT & ADARS Not Matching	2
Not Approved: #3 – IRT Status Not Updated	5
Agency Not Yet Reported (Not Yet Due or Extension)	1
MDOT – Approved for Investment Reporting (3-5-18)	1

Fiscal Year 2018

Counties	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	4
Not Approved: #4 – Needs to complete survey	1
Agencies Not Yet Due for Reporting	78
Cities/Villages	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	334

Not Approved: #1 – No IRT User or Data	2
Not Approved: #2 – IRT & ADARS Not Matching	5
Not Approved: #3 – IRT Status Not Updated	97
Not Approved: #4 – Needs to complete survey	17
Agency Not Yet Reported (Not Yet Due)	78
 MDOT – Not Yet Due for Reporting	 1

RAB 2-14-19